

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/821,645	04/08/2004	Ralph E. Wesinger JR.	NES-014COK	8998	
28661	7590 11/27/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.			AHN, SANGWOO		
1657 Hwy 395, Suite 202 Minden, NV 89423			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2166	-	
		DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/821,645	WESINGER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Sangwoo Ahn	2166				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 April 2004</u> .					
,	-					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
O/L. Claim(3) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 April 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.</li> </ul>	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

**Application No. 10/821,645** 

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :02172005,06152005,08172005,02022006,07142006,10252006,11082006.

Art Unit: 2166

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5 - 8, 16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites "said keywords". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation.

Claim 7 and 18 recite "said second set of keywords". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation.

Claim 8 and 19 recite "said content categories". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation which renders the entire claim indefinite.

Examiner also asserts that claims 5 and 16 fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. These claims recite "said content includes keywords". However, Claims 6 and 17 recite "said content includes categories associated to said keywords". Examiner is confused whether "keywords" are the "content", "keywords" and "categories" both are the "content", or "keywords" are just to which categories are associated.

For the purpose of proper examination, Examiner respectfully suggests Applicant to make clarifications.

Art Unit: 2166

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. For an apparatus to be physical object, at least one recited element must be hardware. If all elements would have been reasonably interpreted in light of the disclosure by one of ordinary skill as software alone, the claim is directed to software *per se* and is non-statutory.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,907,837 issued to Patrick J. Ferrel et al. (hereinafter "Ferrel"), in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,832,497 issued to Jeffrey C. Taylor (hereinafter "Taylor).

Regarding claim 1, Ferrel discloses,

A method for creating a personalized home page on a web site comprising: presenting a entry page to the user for user entry of desired content (column 8 lines 1 – 3, column 17 lines 45 – 56, et seq.);

Art Unit: 2166

receiving said entry of desired content from said user (column 8 lines 1-3, column 17 lines 45-56, et seq.);

a user account including said desired content (Figures 1 and 4, column 8 lines 61 – 63, et seq.); and

creating a personalized home page including said desired content (column 7 lines 61 - 62, column 8 lines 39 - 43; 61 - 63, et seq.).

Ferrel does not explicitly disclose,

associating user account on said web site with said home page, said account including desire content and an associated user ID and password.

However, Taylor discloses associating user account on said web site with said home page, said account including said desire content and an associated user ID and password (column 3 lines 61 – 62, column 4 lines 54 – 58, column 5 lines 40 – 41, et seq.). At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the data processing art to combine the two references because Taylor's user account with desired content, user ID and password would have enabled Ferrel's overall system to have security features that would specify who may access the contents. The combination would result in a secure system operable to lead a user through certain steps and parameters to a search/organization by categories.

Regarding claim 2, Ferrel discloses said content includes categories of information (Figures 22 – 24, column 21 lines 40 – 53, column 17 lines 49 – 50, et seq.).

Regarding claim 3, Ferrel discloses non-textual information associated with said categories (column 7 lines 61 – 62, et seq.).

Art Unit: 2166

Regarding claim 4, Ferrel discloses said non-textual information includes graphics (column 9 lines 15 – 16, et seq.).

Regarding claim 5, Ferrel discloses said content includes keywords (column 27 line 40, column 17 lines 45 – 50, et seq.)

Regarding claim 6, Ferrel discloses said content includes categories associated to said keywords (column 27 line 40, column 17 lines 45 – 50, column 23 lines 56 – 62, et seq.).

Regarding claim 7, Ferrel discloses said content includes categories associated to said second set of keywords (column 27 line 40, column 17 lines 45 – 50, et seq.).

Regarding claim 8, Ferrel discloses said content categories associated to said keywords and further associated to an additional set of categories (column 27 line 40, column 17 lines 45 – 50, et seq.).

Regarding claim 9, Taylor discloses said account further includes personalized information (column 5 lines 33 – 58, et seq.).

Regarding claim 10, Taylor discloses said personalized information includes a URL to the user's homepage (column 5 lines 33 – 58, et seq.).

Regarding claim 11, Taylor discloses the act of password-protecting said account (column 3 lines 61 – 62, column 4 lines 54 – 58, column 5 lines 40 – 41, et seq.).

Claims 12 – 22 are rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claims 1 – 11 rejections.

Art Unit: 2166

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent Number 5,870,552 issued to Linda T. Dozier et al discloses a

publishing system to create and publish hypermedia content in electronic form.

U.S. Patent Number 5,732,219 issued to Thomas P. Blumer et al discloses a

system for remotely editing document objects stored on server via a communication

channel.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sangwoo Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-

5626. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571)272-3978. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Sangwoo Ahn Patent Examiner

AU 2166

11/16/2006 SW

HOSAIN ALAM UPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 6